

REMARKS

The Specification and Claim 20 have been amended. Claims 34 - 41 have been added. No new matter has been introduced with these amendments or added claims, all of which are supported in the application as originally filed. Claims 3 - 5, 7 - 9, 11 - 13, 20, and 31 - 41 are now in the application.

Applicants are not conceding that the subject matter encompassed by the claims as presented prior to this Amendment is not patentable over the art cited by the Examiner, and claim amendments and cancellations in the present application are directed toward facilitating expeditious prosecution of the application and allowance of the currently-presented claims at an early date. Applicants respectfully reserve the right to pursue claims, including the subject matter encompassed by the claims as presented prior to this Amendment and additional claims, in one or more continuing applications.

I. Incorrect Claim Language is Presented in the Office Action

Applicants respectfully note that the Office Action dated January 8, 2009 (hereinafter, “the Office Action”) misstates the current claim language of Applicants’ claims. In particular, it appears that claim language that Applicants have deleted has not been removed from the recitations in the Office Action.

For example, line 10 on Page 5 of the Office Action states (with reference to the “using” claim element on lines 11 - 12 of Claim 13):

for according to a first syntax level while generating the output objects to conform to the

However, Applicants have previously deleted “according to a first syntax level while” from this claim language. See Applicants’ response dated April 28, 2008.

As another example, the last 2 lines on Page 7 of the Office Action recite (with reference to Claim 31):

to dynamically select a syntax abstraction level for use when generating output from the validating parser (see column 3, lines 27 - 42);

However, Applicants respectfully note that Claim 31 does not contain this claim language. This claim language was deleted in Applicants’ response dated April 28, 2008.

Many additional instances of incorrect claim language are present in the Office Action. Applicants respectfully request that the proper claim language be presented in the Office Action, in order that Applicants can accurately evaluate the rejection.

II. Rejection under 35 U. S. C. §103(a)

Paragraph 4 of the Office Action states that Claims 3 - 5, 7 - 9, 11 - 13, 20, and 31 - 33 are rejected under 35 U. S. C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U. S. Patent 7,065,742 to Bogdan in view of U. S. Patent Publication 2005/0149847 to Chandler in view of U. S. Patent 7,458,082 to Slaughter et al. (hereinafter, “Slaughter”). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicants respectfully submit that a *prima facie* case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. §103 has not been made out as to their current claims, as the cited references, whether taken singly or in combination, do not teach or suggest all the claim limitations. Furthermore, Applicants are entitled to have all words of the claimed invention considered when determining patentability. See Section 2143.03 of the MPEP, “All Claim Limitations Must Be Considered”, referencing *In re Wilson*, 165 USPQ 494, 496 (C.C.P.A. 1970), which stated “*All words in a claim must be considered in judging the patentability of that claim against the prior art.*” (emphasis added).

Referring first to Applicants’ independent Claim 13, the Office Action admits on Page 5, lines 19 - 20 that Bogdan “fails to explicitly disclose the further limitation wherein the first schema definition is identified in the input document” (referring to claim language recited on line 4 of Claim 13). At the same time, however, the Office Action presents contradictory information, asserting that Bogdan does teach this recitation. See Page 4, line 19 - Page 5, line 4 of the Office Action, stating “Referring to claim 13, Bogdan discloses ... a first schema [extended schema] definition identified in the input document ...” and citing Bogdan’s col. 2, line 56 - col. 3, line 44. The Examiner is respectfully requested to clarify this contradiction in the Office Action.

Applicants also respectfully note that the Office Action fails to provide a citation for the claim language reciting

- “using the validating parser for validating whether the syntax elements of the input document conform to the first schema definition” (Claim 13, lines 8 - 9). See

Office Action, Page 5, lines 5 - 6; and

- “using the validating parser, responsive to the validating of the syntax elements, for generating the output objects to conform to the second schema definition” (Claim 13, lines 11 - 12). See Office Action, Page 5, lines 9 - 12.

The Office Action admits that a combination of Bogdan and Chandler “fails to explicitly disclose” the “... generating further comprises not generating ...” claim element recited on lines 16 - 18 of Claim 13, and cites col. 45, lines 4 - 35 of Slaughter as teaching this claim element. Office Action, Page 6, lines 9 - 22. Applicants respectfully disagree, as will now be discussed.

The cited text of Slaughter states that “Each space ... may have an XML schema definition defining the core functionality of the space service” (col. 45, lines 4 - 5), and indicates that a “base level” of messages of the service may be provided by all space services (col. 45, lines 7 - 11). Furthermore, additional functionality may be supported by more advanced clients (col. 45, lines 11 - 12), and additional messages may be added to the XML schema (col. 45, lines 13 - 15). The additional functionality may be provided by extended XML schemas or schema extensions (col. 45, lines 18 - 21). This appears to be a discussion of prior art use of schema extensions, adapted for use with space services.

Col. 45, lines 21 - 23 of Slaughter state “The extended schemas may include the base schema so that clients of an extended space may still access the space as a base space.”. However, Applicants respectfully submit that this does not teach, or suggest, their recited “not

generating any output object for any ... syntax element that is defined in the extended schema but not defined in the base schema ...” (Claim 13, lines 16 - 18). The meaning of this text from Slaughter is not entirely clear. In one interpretation, this text may simply indicate that messages from the base schema are still available to those advanced clients that are able to support the additional messages (or more generally, the added functionality) defined in schema extensions. In an alternative interpretation, this text indicates that clients that cannot support advanced functionality will request that the parser use the base schema. According to the first interpretation, Applicants respectfully submit that the advanced client has access to all of the messages/functionality as defined in the combination of the base schema and the schema extensions, and that this in no way teaches or suggests the “not generating” claim language as recited in Applicants’ Claim 13. The second interpretation is discussed below, with reference to lines 32 - 35 of col. 45, where it is demonstrated that Slaughter does not teach the approach recited in Claim 13.

Col. 45, lines 24 - 26 of Slaughter state that a base space service may provide a transient repository of XML documents. Col. 45, lines 26 - 30 then state that a base space service might not provide various advanced facilities. Applicants respectfully submit that this text appears to have no relevance to their claim language as recited on lines 16 - 18 of Claim 13.

Col. 45, lines 30 - 32 of Slaughter describe a mechanism for supporting various functions by extending an XML schema. This appears to be a prior art use of schema extensions, adapted for use with space services, which in no way teaches the claim language recited on lines 16 - 18 of

Claim 13.

Col. 45, lines 32 - 35 of Slaughter state

Since extended spaces still include the base XML schema, clients may still treat extended spaces as base spaces, when just the base space functionality is all that is need[ed] or all that can be supported.

However, Applicants respectfully note that this appears to be a discussion of the prior art approach described in Applicants' specification on Page 7, lines 11 - 12 *et seq.*, which states

Alternatively, the consumer application may instruct the parser 520 as to which schema extension should be used. (emphasis added)

See also the discussion of prior art problems with extended schemas that begins on Page 6, line 6 and continues through Page 10, line 13 of Applicants' specification. As described therein, a parser may be instructed – by the client application – to use a base schema even though a schema extension is available in scenarios where the client cannot support the schema extension. This prior art approach *differs* from Applicants' recited claim language. Applicants' specification describes two alternative techniques with which prior art parsers handle this base schema vs. extended schema situation.

1. In a first approach, the validating parser uses the extended schema for validation, thus ensuring that all of the parsed syntax is valid; the parser then delivers objects to the client application that adhere to the extended schema, and the client application – which needs objects that adhere to the base schema – is responsible for providing special logic adapted for dealing with these “unexpected” input values. See Page 9, line 14 - Page 10, line 4 of Applicants' specification, where

this is discussed.

2. In a second approach, the validation in a prior art approach is turned off, and the parser generates objects according to the base schema. The client therefore receives only syntax that adheres to the base schema, such that no special client error-handling logic is required. However, a drawback of this approach is that the input document may contain errors in the syntax portion that pertains to the extended schema, and these errors will go undetected because the validating is turned off. See Page 10, lines 4 - 13 of Applicants' specification, where this is discussed (where Page 10, lines 4 - 9 discusses why it is necessary to turn off the validating).

In sharp contrast to this prior art approach, Applicants' Claim 13 recites validating the input document according to the extended schema (see Claim 13, lines 8 - 10), but then not generating output objects for any of the extended syntax that is not defined in the base schema (see Claim 13, lines 11 - 18). Using the examples from Applicants' application, if the input document includes an "age" attribute according to the schema extension defined in Fig. 3B, the value of that attribute can be validated to ensure that it is an integer (see Fig. 3B, reference number 353). This validating in terms of the extended schema is recited on lines 8 - 10 of Claim 13. At the same time, because this "age" attribute is not defined in the base schema illustrated in Fig. 1, the generating conforms to the base schema (Claim 13, lines 11 - 15) and therefore does not generate an output object (Claim 13, lines 16 - 18) for the age attribute in this example.

In summary, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited text from col. 45, lines 4 - 35 of Slaughter has no teaching or suggestion of “using [a] validating parser ... for generating the output objects ...” (Claim 13, lines 11 - 12) where this generating further comprises not generating certain output objects (as recited at Claim 13, lines 16 - 18). Instead, as has been explained above, the discussions in Slaughter suggest nothing more than the prior art approaches which Applicants have described on Pages 6 - 10 of their specification.

Because the Office Action admits that Bogdan and Chandler do not “explicitly” disclose the “generating further comprises not generating ...” claim element recited on lines 16 - 18 of Claim 13, and Applicants have demonstrated above that Slaughter does not cure this deficiency, Applicants respectfully submit that any combination of these references (assuming, *arguendo*, that such combination could be made and that one of skill in the art was motivated to attempt it) would not yield Applicants’ claimed invention as recited in Claim 13. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that independent Claim 13 is patentable over the references.

Dependent Claim 20, which depends from Claim 13, recites use of an intermediate schema extension. For example, this intermediate schema may correspond to “Ext 1” as illustrated in Fig. 8, and might define an “age” attribute that extends the “Base” schema (see Claim 20, lines 3 - 4) whereas the extended schema might then correspond to “Ext 2” in Fig. 8 and might define a “marital status” attribute that further extends the intermediate schema (see Claim 20, lines 5 - 6). Dependent Claim 20 recites that the generating does not generate any output object for the extensions of the intermediate schema (see Claim 20, lines 7 - 8). In the example, the validation

thus validates both the “age” attribute and the “marital status” attribute, but the generating does not generate an output object for either of these extensions.

With reference to the claim language of Claim 20, the Office Action cites Bogdan, col. 11, lines 18 - 44. Office Action, Page 7, lines 6 - 14. However, Applicants respectfully note that the Office Action has already admitted that Bogdan does not teach the “not generating” as recited for an extended schema in Claim 13, and thus Bogdan clearly does not teach the additional “not generating” for an intermediate schema as recited in Claim 20. The Office Action therefore fails to make out a *prima facie* case of obviousness as to Claim 20.

Referring next to independent Claim 31, the Office Action admits on Page 9, lines 1 - 20 that Bogdan and Chandler “fails to explicitly disclose the further limitation of responsive to the validating ...”, referring to claim language recited on lines 11 - 15 of Claim 31. Slaughter is then cited, referring to col. 45, lines 4 - 35. This cited text from Slaughter has been discussed above with reference to Claim 13, and the arguments presented therein apply in an analogous manner to the claim language recited on lines 11 - 15 of Claim 31. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that independent Claim 31 is patentable over the references.

Referring next to independent Claim 32, the Office Action admits on Page 11, lines 4 - 17 that Bogdan and Chandler “fail to explicitly disclose the further limitation of omitting ...”, referring to claim language recited on lines 6 - 9 of Claim 32. Slaughter is then cited, referring to col. 45, lines 4 - 35. This cited text from Slaughter has been discussed above with reference to

Claim 13, and the arguments presented therein apply in an analogous manner to the claim language recited on lines 6 - 9 of Claim 32. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that independent Claim 32 is patentable over the references.

Dependent Claims 3 - 5, 7 - 9, 11 - 12, 20, and 33 are deemed patentable by virtue of at least the patentability of the independent claims from which they depend.

In view of the above, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the §103 rejection of all remaining claims as currently presented.

III. Added Claims 34 - 41

Added independent Claims 36 and 39 recite claim language similar to that of Claim 32, and are patentable according to the same arguments as presented herein for Claim 32. Added dependent Claims 34 - 35, 38, and 41 are deemed patentable by virtue of the allowability of the independent claims from which they depend, and further in view of the arguments presented herein with regard to Claim 20. Added dependent Claims 37 and 40 are deemed patentable by virtue of at least the allowability of the independent claims from which they depend.

IV. Conclusion

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the pending rejected claims, withdrawal of all presently outstanding rejections, and allowance of all currently-presented claims at an early date.

Respectfully submitted,

/Marcia L. Doubet/

Cust. Nbr. for Corr.: 43168

Phone: 407-343-7586

Fax: 407-343-7587

Marcia L. Doubet

Attorney for Applicants

Reg. No. 40,999